

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.42564 of 2015**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -293 Year- 2015 Thana -SUPAUL District- SUPAUL

Santosh Kumar Pappu S/o Kushum Lal yadav R/o Gaurav Gardh W.N. 6  
Nagar Parishad Supaul, P.S Supaul Dist supaul former Executive Asst. Dist  
Welfare Officer,Supual.

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Ajit Kumar(App)

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR**  
**JHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4 08-12-2015 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Supaul P.S.  
Case No. 293/2015, registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 406, 409, 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120B of the Indian  
Penal Code.

The District Welfare Officer, Supaul named the  
petitioner and others and alleged that a sum of Rs. 8,60,400/- was  
to be fraudulently withdrawn. From the verification of CC TV  
camera of the Bank, one Babloo Kumar Chaudhary, a teacher of  
newly established primary school, Bharna was apprehended and  
he confessed his guilt. The cheque was stolen with the help of the  
petitioner and others, who was executive Assistant of the

Department and it is alleged that the petitioner had signed that cheque.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not at all responsible for theft of the cheque and fraudulent withdrawal of money. The petitioner was not even posted in the office at the relevant time. Save and except the statement of Babloo Kumar Chaudhary, there is no material to show the involvement of the petitioner.

From perusal of the record, it appears that Babloo Kumar Chaudhary, who is a teacher got the cheque with the help of the petitioner and others and Babloo Kumar Chaudhary has very categorically narrated the entire story of fraudulent withdrawal of government money with the help of the petitioner and others and the petitioner is said to have put his signature on the cheque.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

**(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)**

Rakhi

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|